

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on April 23, 2003, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17-33, 35, and 37-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Adachi (U.S. Patent No. 5,636,336) ("Adachi"); and claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi. The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-44 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17-33, 35, and 37-44 are independent claims.

Foreign Priority:

The examiner has not yet acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority and submission of a certified copy of the foreign priority document, which were filed in the parent application (Serial No. 08/745,285; now issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,181,337). The Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner acknowledge the same by additionally checking boxes 13, 13(a), and 13(a)(2) on the Office Action Summary.

Information Disclosure Statement:

The examiner has not yet acknowledged the form PTO-1449, which was submitted with an Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 13, 2000. Although box 3 under Attachment(s) on the Office Action Summary was checked, no such attachment was included with the Office Action. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner sign, acknowledge, and return the same to the undersigned.

Claim Amendments:

Claims 19 and 20 are amended herein to correct typographical errors. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Rejections of Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37, and 41:

Although the examiner stated that Adachi discusses reducing “a density of second elements, (i.e., thinning out),” (Office Action, p. 2) the present invention involves more than merely the thinning-out process. The present invention performs a density control process that gradually reduces the density of the second elements, as described in the Specification at page 14, line 32 to page 15, line 5. Conversely, the thinning-out process of Adachi reduces a size of the displayed image, while the density control process of the present invention reduces a density or concentration of the displayed image while the size of the displayed image is gradually reduced by the thinning-out process. Adachi does not disclose or suggest the control of the density or concentration of the displayed image to be deleted.

In contrast, independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 33, and 37 of the subject application recite reducing “a density of a second element of data remaining in the specified area by decreasing a component of the second element of data.” Independent claim 25 of the subject application recites varying “a density of a second element of data remaining on the screen by decreasing a component of the second element of data.” Independent claims 29 and 41 of the subject application recite varying “a density of a second element of data remaining on the screen by varying a component of the second element of data.”

Therefore, independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37, and 41 of the subject application are patentably distinguishable over Adachi. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections thereto.

Rejections of Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 18, 22, 26, 30, 35, 38, and 42:

Although the examiner stated that Adachi discusses controlling “the time interval to be successively to be [sic] shorter depending on the pressure applied to the pen during the deletion process,” (Office Action, p. 3) (errors in original) Adachi merely explains that the speed of the graphic item sucking into the tip of the pen can be varied. However, Adachi does not specifically explain how the speed can be varied, and does not suggest changing the speed, i.e., gradually reducing the speed in accordance with the reduction in the size of the graphic item.

In contrast, independent claims 3 and 15 of the subject application recite controlling “respective time intervals to be successively shorter during which the first elements are successively deleted.” Independent claims 7, 11, and 35 of the subject application recite

controlling "respective time intervals to be successively shorter during which the first elements of data are successively deleted." Independent claims 18, 22, and 38 of the subject application recite controlling "respective time intervals to be successively shorter during which the elements of data are successively deleted." Independent claim 26, 30, and 42 of the subject application recites controlling "respective time intervals to be successively varied during which the elements of data are successively deleted."

Therefore, independent claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 18, 22, 26, 30, 35, 38, and 42 of the subject application are patentably distinguishable over Adachi. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections thereto.

Rejections of Claims 19, 23, 27, 31, 39, 39, and 43:

As discussed above in relation to claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37, and 41, Adachi does not disclose or suggest the control of the density or concentration of the displayed image to be deleted. Therefore, Adachi does not disclose or suggest the reverse operation.

In contrast, independent claims 19, 23, and 39 of the subject application (as amended herein) recite increasing "a density of a second element of data previously restored to the screen by increasing a component of the second element of data." Independent claims 27 and 43 of the subject application recite varying "a density of a second element of data previously restored to the screen by increasing a component of the second element of data." Independent claim 31 of the subject application recites varying "a density of a second element of data previously restored to the screen by varying a component of the second element of data."

Therefore, independent claims 19, 23, 27, 31, 39, 39, and 43 of the subject application (as amended herein) are patentably distinguishable over Adachi. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections thereto.

Rejections of Claims 20, 24, 28, 32, 40, and 44:

As discussed above in relation to claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 18, 22, 26, 30, 35, 38, and 42, Adachi does not specifically explain how the speed can be varied, and does not suggest changing the speed, i.e., gradually reducing the speed in accordance with the reduction in the

size of the graphic item. Therefore, Adachi does not disclose or suggest the reverse operation.

In contrast, independent claims 20, 24, and 40 of the subject application (as amended herein) recite controlling "respective time intervals to be successively longer during which the elements of data successively restored to the screen." Independent claims 28, 32, and 44 of the subject application recites controlling "respective time intervals to be successively varied during which the elements of data are successively restored to the screen."

Therefore, independent claims 20, 24, 28, 32, 40, and 44 of the subject application (as amended herein) are patentably distinguishable over Adachi. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections thereto.

Rejections of Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 34, and 36:

In addition to being allowable based on their dependency, directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 33, and 35, dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 34, and 36 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own.

Specifically, when a user presses a pen against a display screen, the user may prematurely release the pen if completion of the deleting operation is not indicated on the display screen. However, Adachi does not refer to such a problem. In contrast, dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 34, and 36 of the subject application recite displaying "a predetermined image at a specified position on the screen when all the second elements of data have been deleted as first elements of data."

Therefore, dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 34, and 36 of the subject application (as amended herein) are patentably distinguishable over Adachi. The Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections thereto.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.


There being no further objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned

to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-23-2003

By: 
Matthew Q. Ammon
Registration No. 50,346

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500